



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,515	01/30/2004	Bhanwar Singh	AMDP999US/H1920	6654
23623 7590 03/27/2008 AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 1900 EAST 9TH STREET, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 24TH FLOOR, CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER RUGGLES, JOHN S	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/27/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10768515	1/30/04	SINGH ET AL.	AMDP999US/H1920

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
1900 EAST 9TH STREET, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
24TH FLOOR,
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

John Ruggles

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

1795	20080318
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed on 8/27/07 is noted by the Examiner and this application is before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) for a decision on the appeal.

It is further noted that Appellants have again misunderstood the grounds of rejection relied upon by the Examiner (as previously indicated in the 6/27/07 Examiner's Answer, especially pages 4-8 and 13-17). In particular, on pages 2-4 of the reply brief, Appellants continue to argue against art rejections of claims 1-3 under 35 USC 102(b) alone, but the art rejections (of claims 1-3) actually relied upon by the Examiner are under 35 USC 102(b)/103(a) in alternative form, based on the inherency of prior art mask structure(s) to function in the manner recited by the instant claims.

Appellants' further arguments are unpersuasive and it is still believed that the rejections should be sustained.

/John Ruggles/
571-272-1390

/Gregory L Mills/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1700
Director's Designee for Supplemental Answers